



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MISCELLANY AND NOTICES.

MEMORANDUM ON EFFORTS TO DETERMINE THE AREA
AND POPULATION OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.¹

Area.—The accuracy of any determination of considerable areas, such as these islands, depends on —

1. The accuracy of the surveys.
2. The accuracy of the maps constructed from these surveys.
3. The accuracy of the measurements made on the maps.

About the progress and trustworthiness of the *surveys* of the Philippine Islands I have thus far obtained no specific information. Doubtless they are very imperfect and inaccurate.

The maps which have been used for determinations of area, so far as I have ascertained, are these : —

1. An undetermined map made prior to 1858 and the basis for the official Spanish measurements contained in the *Anuario estadístico de España* for that year.
2. The map contained in Francisco Coello's *Reseñas geográfica*, etc., *de España*, published for the Statistical Commission of Spain, at Madrid, in 1859.
3. The Spanish Hydrographic Map, the date and title of which are unknown to me.
4. The map made by B. Domann, under direction of F. Blumentritt, and accompanying the latter's paper on the "Ethnography of the Philippines," 1882.

The measurements of area which have been made from the foregoing maps are as follows : —

1. The official Spanish figures dating back at least to the Spanish Statistical Year-Book for 1858 and found in that volume.
2. A measurement made from the map in Coello's *Atlas* by F. Jagor, the results of which are found in *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, viii, 1873, Heft 3.
3. A measurement made by the same man from the Spanish Hydrographic Map and published in the same place.

¹ The information contained in this memorandum has been derived mainly from the successive issues of *Die Bevölkerung der Erde* contained in the supplementary volumes of Petermann's *Mittheilungen*.—W. F. W.

[NOTE.—The main results of measurements 2 and 3 for the larger islands are found in F. Jagor, *Reisen in den Philippinen*, 1873, but not in the English translation.]

4. A measurement made in Perthes *Geographischer Anstalt* from the Blumentritt-Domann map.

An attempt to collate the results of these measurements for the larger islands follows :—

AREAS OF THE MAIN ISLANDS OF THE PHILIPPINES IN SQUARE MILES ACCORDING TO FOUR PRESUMABLY INDEPENDENT MEASUREMENTS.

Islands.	Official Spanish Figures.	Jagor's Measurements.		Perthes Measurements from the Domann Map.
		From Spanish Hydrographic Map.	From Map in Coello's Atlas.	
Luzon.....	42,840	41,100	41,125	40,900
Mindanao.....	32,720	34,560	33,380	37,190
Palawan.....	5,349	5,005	?	4,578
Samar.....	4,702	4,848	5,028	5,169
Panay.....	4,553	6,749	4,746	4,636
Mindoro.....	3,726	3,870	3,940	3,936
Leyte.....	3,669	3,472	3,591	2,717
Negros.....	3,362	4,844	3,478	4,673
Cebu.....	2,288	1,618	2,216	1,814
Entire group.....	114,130	114,650	112,550	114,360

In 1888 the Spanish official publication, *Reseña geog. y estad. de España* declared that the area of the islands was not even approximately known, and only for Luzon and the neighboring islands could it be given with confidence.

It is probable that the Blumentritt-Domann map is the most accurate of the four, and practically certain that the measurements made from it were more careful and accurate than those in the other three cases. Hence if any one of the foregoing must be used the last column is to be preferred.

The population of the islands in 1872 was stated in a letter to *Nature* (6 : 162), from Manila, by Dr. A. B. Meyer, who gives "the latest not yet published statistics" as his authority. The letter gives the population of nine islands, as follows :—

Luzon	4,467,111	Negros	255,873
Panay	1,052,586	Samar	250,062
Cebu	427,356	Mindanao	191,802
Leyte	285,495	Mindoro	70,926
Bohol	283,515		

It also gives the population of each of the 43 provinces of the islands. The population was not counted but estimated. The number who paid tribute was stated as 1,232,544. How this was ascertained we are not informed. The total population 7,451,352 was approximated "on the supposition that about the sixth part of the whole has to pay tribute." In reality this population is 6.046 times the assigned tribute paying population.

But Dr. Meyer adds: "As there exist in all the islands, even in Luzon, independent tribes and a large number in Mindanao, the number of 7,451,352 gives no correct idea of the real population of the Philippines. This is not known at all and will not be known for a long time to come."

Since 1872 there have been actual enumerations of the Philippines, but authorities differ as to the time when they occurred and the detailed results. These enumerations were usually confined to the subject and Catholic population and omitted the heathen, Mohammedan and independent tribes.

Four reports of the *entire* population have been printed:—

1. A report made by the religious orders in 1876 or 1877 in which the nationalities and creeds of the population were distinguished.
2. A manuscript report to Professor Blumentritt of the enumeration made by the religious orders in December, 1879.
3. The official report of the civil census of December 31, 1877, contained in *Reseña geog. y estad. de España*, 1888, p. 1079.
4. The official report upon the census taken by the civil officers December 31, 1887, and printed in the first volume of *Censo de la Poblacion de España*, at Madrid, in 1891.

The *first two* may be compared and tend somewhat to corroborate each other as follows:—

	1876-77.	1879.
1. Tribute-paying natives . . .	5,501,356	
2. Army	14,545	
3. Navy	2,924	
4. Religious officers (Geistlichkeit)	1,962	
5. Civil officers	5,552	
6. Other Spaniards	13,265	
Total Spaniards	38,248	
Total Catholics	5,539,604	5,777,522
Heathen or Mohammedan natives.	602,853	632,645
Foreigners (in 1876 there were:		
British 176, German 109, Ameri-		
cans 42, French 30)	378	592
Chinese	30,797	39,054
Total	6,173,632	6,449,813

The *third* enumeration reported 5,567,685 as the tribute paying population. To this number should be added the estimated number of the independent tribes, "Indios no sometidos"; this according to the missionaries' count was about 600,000, making a total of 6,167,685. Most experts agree that this official report is untrustworthy and involves serious omissions, but believe that the facts are so imperfectly known that they are unable to correct it.

One author, del Pac, writing in 1882, started from the missionaries' census of 1876-77, *viz.*, 6,173,632, assumed that this omitted as many as 600,000 members of independent tribes and that the increase of 1876-82 would be 740,000. In this way he got 7,513,632. A second writer, Sanciano,¹ estimated the population in 1881 as 10,260,249.

The missionaries made an estimate of their own in 1885 which showed 9,529,841.

The *fourth* enumeration of those mentioned above showed a population of 5,985,123 in 1887, and the totals both for the group as a whole and for the fifty odd provinces tend to confirm and to be confirmed by the civil count of 1877. This number, however, represents only the nominally Catholic or tribute-paying population. To it must be added the Mohammedan or heathen tribes set down by clerical authorities as about 600,000. Perhaps the highest authority in this field, Professor Blumentritt, is confident that this number does not include all the independent tribes but only those in the mountains who have a special arrangement freeing them from all the dues of the subject tribes. On the whole, therefore, Professor H. Wagner is inclined to estimate these omissions of independent or non-Christian tribes at about 1,000,000 and the population of the group at about 7,000,000. This result is endorsed by the latest German authority, Hübner's *Geographisch-Statistische Tabellen* for 1898, which gives the population as 5,985,124 + 1,000,000 = 6,985,124.

Personally I am disposed to suspect that this number, although called by Professor Wagner an outside estimate, is below rather than above the truth. In favor of this position it may be urged that Professor Wagner's estimate makes no allowance either for the natural increase of population, 1887-1898, or for the fact that the first careful census of densely populated regions, like India and Japan, usually reveals a

¹ Sanciano, *El Progreso de Filipinas*, Madrid, 1881.

larger population than had been previously estimated. This analogy might reasonably be applied to Luzon and the Visayas. Against my opinion it may be urged that the rebellion in the islands and the disorders attending it may have prevented any increase or even caused a decrease of the total population. How much weight should be given to this consideration I am unable to say.

Census Office, June, 1899.

W. F. WILLCOX.

NOTES CONCERNING THE RATES OF INTEREST IN CALIFORNIA.

The layman might suppose that it is easy to ascertain the rates of interest on money lent which have prevailed at different times and in different places. Such a supposition would, however, be far from the truth. Every economist discovers, sooner or later, that among the data which he most frequently requires for use in his work few are harder to obtain than the average rates of interest. To be sure the daily papers and the financial journals give us the asking or published rates of interest in different cities for several different kinds of loans. But such statements do not prove of much use for scientific purposes. They are usually in a very general form, purporting to give the highest and the lowest rates; and they give us no clue to the amounts loaned at each of the different rates. Hence it is not possible to ascertain the averages. What we require for solving most economic problems which involve interest is not the asking rate but the average rate actually paid. This varies from the rates as usually quoted because the circumstances of many of the individual borrowers differ, for better or for worse, from those of the persons to whom money is offered at the quoted rates.

To illustrate the difficulties: I found, in the daily papers, that on a certain date the quotations for commercial loans in San Francisco were 7 to 8 per cent; but on inquiry I ascertained that such loans had been negotiated on the same day at rates ranging from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to $7\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, and the average for the day's business in five large banks was about $5\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. On the same day call loans secured by a deposit of bonds were quoted at 6 to 8 per cent, and the average rate was found to be 4.83 per cent, a very surprising discrepancy. Again